

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,767	05/27/2005	Masakazu Baba	Q88071	4363
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 02/15/200° ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVENUE, N	RINEHART, KENNETH		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	N. DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3749	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_
-
C

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/536,767	BABA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kenneth B. Rinehart	3749		

	Examine	Aitoille				
	Kenneth B. Rinehart	3749				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 30 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
AMENDMENTS 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>see attached</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	* **	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	•	•				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a I).			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ii or the status or the claims after e	nity is below of attach	ieu.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but.	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/536,767 Page 2

Art Unit: 3749

The applicant argues that Feistel discloses a sample drying area. The examiner disagrees. The limitations in this claim are exceptionally broad. When the fluid enters area 40 it is being removed form another area and therefore drying is occurring. Therefore, the examiner does not believe that it is unreasonable for the reference to read on the broad claim limitation. The applicant is correct in that the 35 USC 102 (a) reference is a typographical error. Regarding claim 2, examination on the merits has ended. It should be kept in mind that applicant cannot, as a matter of right, amend any finally rejected claims or add new claims after a final rejection (37 CFR 1.116). In the response the applicant has amended claim 2 with no justification. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. In this case, both references are directed to the problem of the separation of materials, and therefore there would have been motivation to combine the references. Additionally, the applicant has failed to provide good and sufficient reasons why the amendment is necessary and was not earlier introduced (37 CFR 1.116(b)). Therefore, the amendment will not be entered.

KENNETH RINEHART
PRIMARY EXAMINER